INTRODUCTION.

The occasion that suggested the exposition that is now submitted, The following exposition, to which attention is earnestly solicited, was suggested by an aged Wesleyan Methodist Minister, now deceased, (the Revd. A. Prindle.) Having frequently heard

that he was accustomed to think independently, as well as clearly, and coherently, and having unexpectedly met with him, I availed myself of the opportunity to request a statement of the result of his meditations on the much controverted passage that is now before us. reply was to this effect: he had heard and read much about it from interpreters of different denominations, but nothing of a satisfactory character. The reason was this; he perceived that all alike, neglected both the preceding and succeeding context; and applied the intermediate words to a subject not there spoken of, and to characters not mentioned there: that the Apostle, however, gives no indication of any intended transition of thought: that hence the first, because the most natural inquiry, is this: Might not the apostle's words be applied, in some legitimate and important sense, to the very subject on which he was professedly treating, in the verses immediately before and after them? Treasuring up these remarks, we have examined the matter. The exposition now submitted is the result.

Preliminary criticism, showing that Calvinism has no basis in this passage, tho' usually deemed its "strongest and least equivocal proof-text," and that Arminians, too, have misapplied these verses.

It has been shrewdly observed, that the surest way to prevent the discovery of truth, is to set up something in the stead of it. If so, to remove what has been thus set up, is, in such cases, a preparatory work of great importance. We deem it advisable, therefore, to occupy a few introductory pages, in shewing that certain prominent annotations, have no foundation in these

verses. A refutation of the doctrines involved in any of these inter-

preta true

Ever makes with ceding senter that those

Which

the pr

speaks
love G
which
these v
not inverance
Revd.
of Pub

To a no cons

would
How is
manifes
forekno
on spec
charact
These v
forekno
in whiel
ledge b